



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,338	10/26/2001	Majid Syed	708034-605-001	3234

7590 01/12/2010  
Blaney Harper  
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue  
51 Louisiana Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20001

EXAMINER
----------

LEE, PHILIP C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2448

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/12/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/007,338	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SYED, MAJID	
	<b>Examiner</b> PHILIP C. LEE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2448	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-36, 39, 40, 65-79 and 81-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-36, 39, 40, 65-79 and 81-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on November 9, 2009.
2. Claims 1-14, 16-36, 39-40, 65-79 and 81-93 are presented for examination.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2448

4. 7. Claims 1,18, 21-23, 25, 66, 83, 86-87, 89-90 and 93 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Corts et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication

2002/0095228 (hereinafter Corts).

5. Corts was cited in the last office action.

6. As per claim 1, Corts taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

A gateway (e.g., multipurpose device such as the black box in combination with IBOC transmission device), the gateway comprising a processing system ([217]); and a memory coupled to the processing system ([217]);

Said processing system comprising:

a network inbound queue for the reception of data content and instructions from a content provider ([0030], [0213], [0275]-[0276], [0337]);

a scheduler for processing said instructions from the content provider to determine broadcast times and schedule for said data content to be received by digital radio

broadcast receivers of users ([0030], [0232]-[0233], [0235], [0285], [0278], [0318]);

an encoder for encoding said data content for digital radio broadcast transmission

([0197], [0275], [0285])an addressing module for processing said instructions from the content provider for extracting addressing information ([0237]-[0238], [0278], [0285]);

and

an outbound queue for storing said encoded data content ([0030], [0275]),

the digital radio broadcast system processing the data content to be pushed to the digital radio broadcast receivers of the users via digital radio broadcast transmission without user-initiated requests for the data content ([0207]).

7. As per claim 66, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claim 1 above. Corts further taught a content provider center configured to communicate with said gateway ([0197], [0213], [0336]).

8. As per claims 18, 25, 83, and 89, Corts taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts further taught data content is in any of the following formats: binary, plain text, HTML, XML, WML (fig. 1, i.e., binary signal broadcast across airwave), and wherein said encoded data content is in a digital broadcasting format suitable for reception via a digital consumer radio receiver (fig. 1, [0021]).

9. As per claims 21 and 86, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts further taught instructions include any of the following: time at which transmission is to commence, time at which transmission is to cease, or rate at which data content to be transmitted needs to be repeated ([207], [209], [232]-[239]).

10. As per claim 22, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claim 1 above. Corts further taught said gateway receives data content over a network (fig. 3; [0023]).

11. As per claims 23 and 87, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 22 and 66 above. Corts further taught said network comprises any of the following: local area network, wide area network, wireless network, or Internet ([224], [336]).

12. As per claim 90, Corts taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Corts further taught comprising an exciter for receiving the encoded data content from the gateway and for broadcasting the encoded data content over the air via digital radio broadcast transmission ([0197]).

13. As per claim 93, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 90 above.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103*

14. Claims 13-14, 16, 78-79 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts.

15. As per claims 13-14 and 78-79, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Although Corts taught a unique identifier, said identifier used in targeting said transmitted data content to a specific user agent ([225], [237]), however, Corts did not specifically teach said identifier is an URI or a numeric value. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a numeric

Art Unit: 2448

value as the identifier because by doing so it would allow specific recipient to be identified in the network.

16. As per claims 16 and 81, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts did not explicitly teach Turbo Broadcast Layer (TBL) encoder. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a TBL encoder or any type of encoder because by doing so it would increase the flexibility of Cort's system by allowing data to be converted to different formats using different type of encoder.

17. Claims 8 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts in view of Holur et al, U.S. Patent 7,539,499 (hereinafter Holur).

18. As per claims 8 and 73, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Although Corts taught a bandwidth module for bandwidth management ([218]), however, Corts does not teach maintaining queues and prioritizing flows per quality of service (QoS) traffic attributes while managing resources. Holur taught maintaining queues and prioritizing flows per quality of service (QoS) traffic attributes while managing resources (col. 5, lines 17-33).

19. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts and Holur because Holur's teaching

Art Unit: 2448

would allow Corts's system to schedule transmission based on available bandwidth using queues.

20. Claims 5, 20, 26, 39, 65, 85 and 91-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts in view of Garrity et al, U.S. Patent 6,745,237 (hereinafter Garrity).

21. Garrity was cited in the last office action.

22. As per claim 5, Corts taught the invention as claimed as in claim 1 above. Corts did not teach an authenticator. Garrity taught an authenticator for authenticating a sender of said instructions (col. 4, lines 46-49).

23. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, and Garrity because Garrity's teaching would increase the security of Corts's system to prevent unauthorized sender to utilize their systems.

24. As per claims 20 and 85, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts did not teach synchronized scheduling. Garrity taught wherein said gateway is networked for synchronized scheduling with one or more similar gateways (fig. 2; col. 3, lines 62-65).



Art Unit: 2448

25. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, and Garrity because Garrity's teach of synchronized scheduling would enhance Corts's system by allowing data to be transmitted to a user in the proper sequence.

26. As per claims 26, 39, and 65, Corts taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

receiving at the gateway, data content and instructions from a content provider ([0030], [0213], [0275]-[0276], [0337]);

processing said instructions from the content provider to determine broadcast times for said data content to be received by a digital radio broadcast receivers of a users ([0030], [0232]-[0233], [0235], [0285], [0278], [0318]), the digital radio broadcast system processing the data content to be pushed to the digital radio broadcast receivers of the users via digital radio broadcast transmission without user-initiated requests for the data content ([0207]);

encoding said data content for digital radio broadcast transmission using a processing system ([0197], [0275], [0285]).

storing said encoded data content at a memory of the gateway ([0030], [0275]).

27. Corts did not teach authenticating said content provider. Garrity taught authenticating said content provider (col. 4, lines 46-49).

Art Unit: 2448

28. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, and Garrity because Garrity's teaching would increase the security of Corts's system to prevent unauthorized sender to utilize their systems.

29. As per claim 91-92, Corts and Garrity taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 26 and 39 above. Corts further taught comprising broadcasting the encoded data content over the air via digital radio broadcast transmission using an exciter ([0197]).

30. Claims 2, 3, and 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts in view of Miller, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0055977 (hereinafter Miller).

31. Miller was cited in the last office action.

32. As per claims 2 and 67, although Corts taught IBOC enabled devices ([0021]), however, Corts did not teach profile defining specific data content formats. Miller taught a device profile database holding profile associated with consumer devices, and each of said profile defining one or more specific data content formats for said transmission (page 4, paragraph 36).

33. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, and Miller because Miller's teaching of

Art Unit: 2448

device profiles would increase the alertness of their system by providing profiles information regarding data format and modality that are compatible with the device of the profile.

34. As per claims 3 and 68, Corts and Miller taught the invention substantially as claimed as in claims 2 and 67 above. Although, Miller taught identifying said one or more specific data content formats associated with one or more specific clients (page 4, paragraph 36), however, Miller did not explicitly teach a request for identifying data content formats. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a request for identifying data content format associated with the clients because by doing so it would increase the alertness of their system by providing profiles information regarding data format and modality that are compatible with the device of the profile.

35. Claims 4 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts in view of Hirayama, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0069718 (hereinafter Hirayama).

36. As per claims 4 and 69, Corts taught the invention as claimed as in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts did not teach unique ID associated with sender. Hirayama taught a identification (ID) processor for extracting a unique ID associated with sender of said received instructions, assigning a unique ID associated with broadcast transmissions, and storing said unique ID associated with the sender of said instructions and said unique ID associated with broadcast transmissions ([0136], [0146], fig. 12)

Art Unit: 2448

37. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts and Hirayama because Hirayama's teaching of unique ID associated with sender would increase the alertness of Corts's system by allowing the push initiator to be determined according to the identifier embedded in the message.

38. Corts, and Hirayama's did not explicitly teach push transmissions. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made that broadcasting can includes push transmission, hence the a unique ID associated with broadcast will be ID associated with push transmission, in order to allow data to be broadcast to user without user request.

39. Claims 9 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts and Holur in view of Kadyk et al, U.S. Patent 7,046,691 (hereinafter Kadyk).

40. Kadyk was cited in the last office action.

41. As per claims 9 and 74, Corts and Holur taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 8 and 73 above. Corts and Holur did not teach active queues and a passive queue. Kadyk taught an active queue storing data content currently being transmitted (250, fig. 2; col. 9, line 50-col. 10, line 3) and a passive queue storing pushed and pulled data content (230, fig. 2; col. 8, lines 38-45).

Art Unit: 2448

42. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, Holur and Kadyk because Kadyk teaching of active queue and passive queue would increase the flexibility of Corts's and Holur's system by allowing the system to read the message from the queue when the system is ready to process a new message (col. 8, lines 40-45).

43. Claims 10, 17, 24, 75, 82, and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts in view of Official Notice.

44. As per claims 10 and 75, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts did not teach a cache. "Official Notice" is taken for the concept of a cache for holding data content to be broadcast is known and accepted in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a cache because by doing so it would increase the efficiency of the system by allowing frequently requested data to be stored and quickly accessed.

45. As per claims 17 and 82, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts did not teach different protocols. "Official Notice" is taken for the concept of point-to-point protocol (PPP), hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), or wireless access protocol, are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include different protocol such as HTTP because by doing so it

Art Unit: 2448

would increase the functionality of the system by allowing browsers to requests webpage from web server on the Internet.

46. As per claims 24 and 88, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts did not teach a network database identifying other databases. "Official Notice" is taken for the concept of network database such as Domain Name System (DNS) server identifying other databases is known and accepted in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include network database such as Domain Name System (DNS) server because by doing so it would increase the alertness of the system by providing Internet Protocol address in response to domain name query.

47. Claims 11 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts in view of Marlow, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0046670 (hereinafter Marlow).

48. Marlow was cited in the last office action.

49. As per claims 11 and 76, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts did not teach precompiled binary data. Marlow taught precompiled binary data for transmission (page 3, paragraph 36).

50. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, and Marlow because Marlow's teaching

Art Unit: 2448

of precompiled binary data for transmission would increase the user flexibility of Corts's system by data to be transformed to values appropriate for viewing by the user at a remote location (page 3, paragraph 36).

51. Claims 12 and 77 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts in view of Ellis et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0194131 (hereinafter Ellis).

52. Ellis was cited in the last office action.

53. As per claims 12 and 77, Corts taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Although Corts taught processes information for broadcasting encoded data content ([197], [0275], [0285]), however, Corts did not teach zone information. Ellis taught processes information defining various time zones for broadcasting said encoded data content (page 10, paragraphs 139 and 140).

54. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, and Ellis because Ellis teaching of defining zone information would increase the flexibility of Corts's system by allowing data content to be presented to a user based on a defined schedule.

55. Claims 19 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts in view of Thompson et al, U.S. Patent 6,907,247 (hereinafter Thompson).

56. Thompson was cited in the last office action.

57. As per claims 19 and 84, Corts taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 66 above. Corts did not teach a timer for tracking timeout. Thompson taught a timer for tracking a predefined timeout for which transmission of data content occurs (col. 4, lines 3-19).

58. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, and Thompson because Thompson's teaching of a timer for tracking timeout would increase the efficiency of Corts's system by allowing resources to be released by a user when a timeout period has expired, hence the released resources can be allocated to other users.

59. Claims 6-7 and 71-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts, and Hirayama in view of Lin et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0146016 (hereinafter Lin).

60. Lin was cited in the last office action.

61. As per claims 6 and 71, Corts, and Hirayama taught the invention substantially as claimed as in claims 4 and 69 above. Although Corts taught said broadcast outbound queue transmitting data content to an external broadcasting network ([30], [0275]), however, Corts did



Art Unit: 2448

not teach transmitting data content to said sender of said instructions. Lin taught network outbound queue transmitting data content to said sender of said received instructions (140, fig. 6; page 4, paragraph 53).

62. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, Hirayama, and Lin because Lin's teaching of queue for transmitting data content to said sender would increase the reliability of their system by allowing packet to be queue in order to retransmit lost packets (page 4, paragraph 53).

63. As per claims 7 and 72, Corts, Hirayama and Lin taught the invention substantially as claimed as in claims 6 and 71 above. Corts further taught an in-band on-channel (IBOC) digital radio broadcast transmission (page 13, paragraph 304).

64. As per claims 27-36 and 40, they fail to define the above and beyond claims (already rejected claims 2, 3, 10 12-14, 18, 23 and 25).

65. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corts, and Hirayama in view of Garrity.

Art Unit: 2448

66. As per claim 70, Corts, and Hirayama taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 69 above. Corts, and Hirayama did not teach an authenticator. Garrity taught an authenticator for authenticating a sender of said instructions (col. 4, lines 46-49).

67. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Corts, Hirayama, and Garrity because Garrity's teaching would increase the security of Corts's, and Hirayama's systems to prevent unauthorized sender to utilize their systems.

68. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, 16-36, 39-40, 65-79 and 81-93, filed 11/9/09 have been considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejections.

69. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lee et al, US 6,829,475

70. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on (571) 272-6703. The

Art Unit: 2448

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip C Lee/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448